REMARKS

Claims 1-6 are pending.

Claims 1-6 are rejected.

Claim 7 is cancelled.

Claims 1 and 6 are amended. A support for the amendments of these claims is among others found at paragraphs [0001], [0005] and [0006] of the application as published (US 2007/0220574 A1).

Claim 2 is amended to correct an antecedent basis problem.

Rejection of Claims 1-6 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Rejection of Claims 1 and 4-6

The Examiner rejected Claims 1 and 4-6 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perrot (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2006/0156362 A1, hereafter Perrot) in view of Ohno et al. (US Patent Publication No. 2003/0149985 A1, hereafter Ohno). Applicants disagree with this ground of rejection.

The Office Action recites Perrot as disclosing all of the steps of Claim 1 with the exception that Perrot does not teach the networks information as being a Network Information Table (NIT) and a Service Description Table (SDT). Although the Applicants agree that Perrot does not teach the presence of these tables, Perrot and Ohno also fail to teach claimed elements as well.

For example, the Office Action asserts that Perrot, at paragraph 0039 lines 1-4, discloses a step of:

"the terminal extracts from the said stream at least the networks information".

Paragraph 0039, lines 1-4 recite:

> *"The STB 303 receives the XML textual files, extracts the discovery information and uses the discovery information to select a transport stream and to determine the localization at which the transport stream is IP multicast."*

In the cited passage Perrot describes that a Set Top Box receives XML files and extracts discovery information, which is used by the terminal to determine the IP multicast localization of a transport stream and to select it. In no way, does the passage disclose the extraction of **network information from a stream**. Rather, Perrot with Ohno describes extraction of **discovery information from a textual file**. According to Perrot's method of broadcasting an offer of multimedia services over an IP network, MSO's provide MPEG-2 transport streams to an IP delivery operator such as an ISP, see [0035] lines 10-11: "*The MSO provides the MPEG-2 transport streams to an IP delivery network operator such as for example an ISP*" and MSO's generate discovery information that is needed at the receiver side, see [0038] lines 1-2 "*The MSOs generate discovery information needed at the receiver side*" and then these MSOs insert the discovery information into textual files e.g., XML files. These XML files are then IP multicast on the IP broadband network. See [0038] lines 7-9 "*The discovery information is inserted into one or many textual files, eg into the well known XML textual file format, and IP multicast on the IP broadband network*". It is clear that in Perrot's method of transmission, the multimedia services and the discovery information are transmitted separately, the first in a transport stream, the second in XML files. This is further clarified by paragraph [0039] lines 1-4 where Perrot mentions that an STB receives separate transport streams and XML textual files:

> *"The STB 303 receives the XML textual files, extracts the discovery information and uses the discovery information to select a transport stream and to determine the localization at which the transport stream is multicast"*

In no way does, Perrot in combination with Ohno disclose or suggest that "the termina| extracts from the said stream at least the Networks Information Table", where "said stream" is a transport stream, as is claimed by claim 1.

Thus Perrot does at least not disclose the feature of claim 1 of "the terminal extracting from the said stream at least the Networks Information Table", let alone that Perrot with Ohno disclose or suggest that the Networks Information Table is extracted from a transport stream transmitted to an IP address on a port as is claimed by the first step of claim 1.

Focusing on Ohno (in view of Perrot), the features missing in Perrot are not found within Ohno. This is in contrast to the Office Action which states that Ohno teaches use of NIT and SDT tables in DVB transmissions in an IP environment.

The Applicants respectfully disagree.

The Applicants submit that Ohno is not at all related to discovery of Digital Video Broadcast services offered on an Internet Protocol type network for reception of Digital Video Broadcast services by the terminal via the Internet Protocol type network. Rather, Ohno clearly mentions in paragraphs [0036 - 0040] that Ohno is related to classical digital television reception via a tuner that is connected to a Radio Frequency (RF) network. See in particular [0038], describing figure 1: "*In FIG.1, reference numeral denotes an antenna; 102, a tuner; 103, a demultiplexer; 104, a video decoder, 105, an audio decoder*" and in paragraph [0039-0040]: "*In the digital television receiver (hereinafter referred to as receiver) 100, a signal received by antenna 101 is inputted in the tuner 102. The tuner applies processing such as demodulation and error correction to the inputted signal, and generates a transport stream (TS) to output it to the multiplexer 103. The multiplexer 103 extracts video data, audio data*"

Paragraphs [0046] and [0047] further confirm that Ohno is about the reception of digital television: "*and a Network Information Table (NIT) which are standardized by the ISO/IEC13818-1, the Association of Radio Industries and Business (ARIB) or the*

like. (..) The EPG data 311 includes a Service Description Table (SDT) (..) which are standardized by the Digital Video Broadcast (DVB) the ARIB, or the like." The cited standards relate to reception of digital television over an RF type network.

The Examiner cites paragraphs 0046, 0051, 0111 and 0117. Paragraph 0111 mentions that the receiver 1700 of FIG.17 is connected via a modem to the Internet. Paragraph 0116 mentions that an EIT stored in memory comprised within an URL. The EIT though is comprised according to [0051] in EPG data which EPG data is extracted from a multiplex [0040] which is received via a tuner and an antenna in the digital television receiver [0039]. Paragraph [0117] then mentions that the URL comprised in the EIT serves for "*information of connection destination on the Internet I from which the data broadcast data which is being downloaded on the channel 101ch before-change, is provided.*" Paragraph [0124] mentions that the modem is used to download from the Internet connection the data which is pointed to by the URL. Paragraph [0126] mentions that the data downloaded via the Internet connection is data broadcast data.

So, Ohno does not disclose extracting a NIT and an SDT from a transport stream transmitted over an IP type network for discovery of Digital Video Broadcast services offered on an Internet Protocol type network. Ohno merely describes using an EIT received via classical RF reception means (antenna, tuner, ...) for finding a URL that points to a collection destination from where data broadcast data can be downloaded.

For the reasons given above, various elements of claim 1 are neither disclosed nor suggested by Perrot and Ohno, alone or in combination.

Therefore, the Applicants submit that claim 1 is in condition for allowance.

Claims 4 and 5 depend on allowable claim 1. The Applicants submit that these claims are therefore also allowable.

Apparatus claim 6 comprises similar limitations as allowable method claim 1 in terms of means and the Applicants submit that claim 6 is therefore also in condition for allowance.

Rejection of Claim 2

The Examiner rejected Claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perrot and Ohno in further view of Cao (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0187161). The Applicants submit that claim 2 is allowable as this claim depends on allowable claim 1.

Rejection of Claim 3

The Examiner rejected Claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perrot and Ohno in further view of Van Willigen (U.S. Patent 7,386,879). The Applicants submit that claim 3 is allowable as this claim depends on allowable claim 1

Having fully addressed the Examiner's rejections, it is believed that, in view of the preceding amendments and remarks, this application stands in condition for allowance. Accordingly then, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully solicited. If, however, the Examiner is of the opinion that such action cannot be taken, the Examiner is invited to contact the applicant's attorney at the phone number below, so that a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview may be scheduled.

Respectfully submitted,
R. Schaefer et al.

By: /Joel M. Fogelson/
Joel M. Fogelson
Reg. No. 43,613

Tel. No. (609) 734-6809

Thomson Licensing, LLC

Serial No. 10/574,328

PF030154
Customer No. 24498

Patent Operations
PO Box 5312
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312
December 8, 2010